

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

PATRICK STOLLAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN WETZEL, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 23-2780-KSM

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of August 2023, upon consideration of Plaintiff Patrick Stollar's "Motion to Mark as Related and Consolidate" (Doc. No. 70) it is hereby **ORDERED** that the motion is **DENIED AS MOOT**.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Karen Spencer Marston
KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.

¹ Plaintiff claims that this case is "nearly identical to a group of cases marked as related and consolidated with *Busanet v. Wetzel*, #21-CV-04286 (McHugh, D.J.)" and for that reason, he "respectfully requests to have this case marked as related and consolidated with *Busanet* as well." (Doc. No. 70.) But Plaintiff's case was consolidated with those cases on August 2, 2023. (See Doc. No. 69 ("[A]fter consultation with the assigned judges, it is ORDERED that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a), the above-captioned civil action is consolidated with the actions previously consolidated before the Honorable Gerald A. McHugh under *Perez v. Wetzel*, et al., Civil No. 21-4796, for purposes of addressing common issues of law and fact prior to trial only.")) Plaintiff mistakenly cites *Busanet* as the Lead Case in this matter, when the cases he references are in fact consolidated under *Perez*. Nonetheless, because Plaintiff's request has already been granted, the Court denies this motion as moot.